Vol. XI, No. 17 HUMAN EVENTS April 28, 1954

LET'S REVIEW A TEXTBOOK

By E. MERRILL ROOT

THE COMMUNISTS' invasion of our education would be a meager thread, soon "liquidated" (to use their own favorite cliché) were it not for the curious, consistent aid that they receive gratis from the non-Communist "intellectuals." Do these "intellectuals" know what they do as they blithely do it, or are they mere somnambulists of the mind, blindly acting from that mass-hypnosis which conditions most of the contemporary world toward the superstition called "collectivism?"

My own explanation of "the neurosis of the intellectuals" (the fine phrase is Whittaker Chambers'), is that theirs is always a *lovers'* quarrel with the Communists — because, though the means they choose are accidentally different, the ends they seek are essentially the same. Both seek by different means — one by voice and votes, one by guile and guns — the single end of the omnipotent state. The "intellectuals" need to understand that just as the wrong means will destroy the best ends, so the wrong ends will vitiate the best means. Because of their adherence to the same essential ends as the Communists, the collectivist "intellectuals," though not Communists, are logically forced to apologize for the Communists and, with suave denials, to do their work.

The collectivist "intellectuals" thus remind me of the unfortunate soldiers the Soviets in the last war used to send out across a dangerous mine field — theirs not to reason why, theirs but to do and die — to clear a path with their own exploded bodies. The "intellectuals," in every country that the Communists have taken over, have paid with their very lives for making that conquest possible; yet they press forward in happy suicide squads!

Let me review an outstanding textbook in history, to prove how the non-Communist "intellectuals" explode the mine fields, and by so doing intellectually explode themselves. Such a review will clearly reveal that they write with so pervasive a compulsion toward the "liberal" collectivist line that history is distorted into perversion and error. The result is not subversion — it is worse. It turns history itself into a lie.

AS A TEXTBOOK for secondary schools, *World History,* by Boak, Slosson and Anderson, occupies a distinguished position. It is published by Houghton Mifflin and Company, with edition dates of 1942 and *1947,* and has not been revised since. Arthur E. R. Boak and Preston Slosson are (or were) professors of Ancient and Modern History, respectively, at the University of Michigan; Howard R. Anderson is (or was) Specialist in Social Sciences in the United States Office of Education. The editor of the volume was Dr. William L. Langer, Professor of History at Harvard University.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1954 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Thus we have a distinguished, influential, characteristic bevy of "intellectuals" of the contemporary fashion, and the book they write may be fairly adduced as representative, highly influential; it is well written. Yet it is consistently slanted, perhaps because of the unconscious prejudice of the "liberal," to produce in young minds an acceptance of the superstition and mass-hypnosis of the collectivist line.

On page 500 there is a picture of Leon Trotsky (Figure 358). It is captioned thus: "Leon Trotsky (1879-1940) was second only to Lenin in the early days of the Soviet Republic. After Lenin's death, he was accused of treason and fled first to Paris and then to Mexico *where he died.*" [Italics mine.] This is factually true and spiritually false. Suppose that in writing the history of Lincoln's Administration, I wrote: "After the conclusion of the Civil War, Lincoln went to Washington *where he died.*" What sense of history would such a true lie give? It is equally a part of contemporary history to know *how* and *why* Trotsky died — to know that he was hunted down by an agent of international Communism and, in a peculiarly brutal manner, *murdered.* Young minds cannot reach a realistic sense of the forces of history today if such a sinister fact is deliberately slurred and suavely evaded.

On pages 526 and 527 there are two pictures (Figure 374, Figure 375.) They are obviously set in purposeful juxtaposition to point a moral and adorn a tale. Figure 374 is purportedly the picture of a Soviet schoolroom; a highly glorified pedagogue, under a sort of Hans Christian Anderson light, is pointing toward a globe before a roomful of enraptured chubby children. The caption is: "In a Russian school pupils are learning geography. Notice the number of globes the class has and the evident interest they take in their work." This is a silly sentimentalizing of the best aspect of one form of the total state.

On the other page, Figure 375 shows "that good gorilla," Benito Mussolini, in a peculiarly revolting posture of pomposity. The authors must have searched far to find so crass a picture. Under it they write: "Benito Mussolini is addressing a Fascist meeting and striking a favorite pose. What kind of ideas does his attitude suggest that he is expressing? What evidence do we find that he enjoys display?" I have myself again and again said far unkinder things about Il Duce, so I have no quarrel with any revelation of his flaws. I simply insist that it is not objective scholarship and that it is not truth to point out the monstrosities of Tweedledee at the same time that you point out the sweetness and right of Tweedledum.

To prove their bias still further, the authors (page 524, Figure 372) present a richly idealized portrait of Stalin. The delicious caption reads: "Although Stalin in recent years has shown himself infrequently, during the seige of Moscow the people of the city took great comfort from the knowledge that he remained there." The people may well have taken comfort from the knowledge that there a happy shell might liquidate Big Brother;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but otherwise (except for official sources of ersatz propaganda), what realistic mind supposes that the Russian people took comfort from the propinquity of their arch-bully?

THE TEXT is just as slanted. What real sense of history can youth get from the comparison of the Bolsheviks to the "Girondins" (not the Jacobins) in the French Revolution (page 525)? Or from the sly slanted statement: "In 1939 Russia shifted again and made a temporary peace pact with Germany?" To tell a half truth is to tell a whole lie. Why do the authors evade the issue of saying outright that, in cynical contempt of its own outcries against Fascism, Communism signed of its own seeking a pact with Hitler, coldbloodedly divided Poland as loot, and *never of its own volition* broke the "temporary peace pact?"

Or what real sense of Communism can youth learn from the following? — (page 526): "The Bolsheviki have devoted quite as much attention to making Russia industrial as to making Russia Communistic. They have preached the gospel of the machine as well as the gospel of Karl Marx. Their greatest object was to transform the Russian from a *dirty, shiftless, ignorant, easy-going* peasant [italics mine] into a *serious, highly trained, efficient* [ibid] industrial worker. It has been an uphill task and is still only half accomplished, and the loss of human life and happiness in the process has been appalling. Perhaps even the aim might be questioned; some people might like the hard, intolerant, scornful young Communist less than his genial old Rip Van Winkle of a grandfather! But the transformation has been a stupendous achievement, like it or not."

"Perhaps," you see — only *perhaps!* — "the aim might be questioned." *Some people* — old fogies, of course! — might prefer corny old Rip Van Winkle to the smart, brash, "young" Communist. (Stalin was over 70 at the time.) The slant is obvious to all who know semantics. An obvious apology and plea indoctrinates youth (which is naturally against "Rip Van Winkles") into a belief that the brutalities are minor, necessary, beneficial, and that the result is (in Hollywood jargon) "stupendous." That the great Tolstoy saw such peasants as the salt and light of the earth, or that good farmers pitchforked willy-nilly from their beloved acres onto the bleak collective farms or to the rigid controls of a machine are unhappy and resentful, is to be ignored: it has been a "stupendous" thing, "like it or not." Youth is quite clearly expected to like it. And youth is never told that the greatest satirist of our time, George Orwell, paints a more realistic picture of the "stupendous achievement" in *Animal Farm.*

What realistic sense of history can come out of such obvious statements slanted into a subtle perversion as: "In general, Russia supported those countries which were governed by Communist parties against those which were not (page 569)?" *In general?*

In speaking of classes in the Soviet, the authors reveal their curious economic axioms. They say (page 523): "The clergy and the businessmen whose income came from rents,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

profits or interest, or from hiring other people to work for them, were not allowed to vote at all." The clergy in America should be surprised to learn that they live by "rent, profits, and interest;" and businessmen should be startled to discover that they live by "hiring others to work for them." Such illusions can only be cured when professors are taken out of their ivy-covered ivory towers and made to learn the facts of life in the give-and-take of the real world. That businessmen live by "hiring others to work for them" is a gem of purest ray serene. Such is the ignorance that is the bliss of the collectivist "intellectuals."

BUT PERHAPS the greatest mischief that this book does concerns China. It says (page 568): "Discontented radical groups (in China), some called liberal and some called Communistic, refused to recognize the authority of the government. *Actually the Chinese Communists were rarely anything but hungry and angry peasants whose chief interest was in getting more land rather than in political and economic theories.* [Italics mine]. General George Marshall, as a special envoy from the United States, labored hard to bring the government and the rebels together, but every time he seemed to get them to agree around the table, the news would come that one group or the other had broken the truce and seized another town. Finally, he gave up the attempt and returned to the United States to become the Secretary of State, in charge of our foreign policy." Since when have such synthetic fairy tales ranked as solid history?

Again, the authors say (page 568): "China is making the more difficult attempt to combine with her own traditions not only the achievements of western science and invention, but also the spirit of 'liberty, equality, and fraternity' which inspired Washington and Jefferson." Is it good history to say that the slogans of the French Revolution "inspired George Washington?" Consider also what actual concrete history has done with the assumption of "democracy" in Red China, when Korean and Chinese prisoners, by the tens of thousands, refused it, and would not even listen to the witch doctors of Communism.

There is more in this slanted, unreliable book to unearth and reveal, but the best word is that of Angelus Silesius: "Friend, woulds't thou more? Then thyself become the book, thyself the reading." But take your tears along.

Professors who have remained free spirits even in the mass-hypnosis of the hour sometimes marvel that students come up from secondary schools with such false axioms, such biased minds, such fantastic ignorance about the facts of life. Let them marvel no more. Let them merely look into the textbooks which poor innocents are forced to read, and they will find full explanation of that intellectual Iron Curtain which has fallen in blight and folly across what used to be the mind of the western world.

Additional Copies: 6—1.00; 10—1.50; 50—5.50; 100—10.00; 500—15.00; 1,000—25.00. Quotations for larger quantities on request.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* FRANK CHODOROV, *Associate Editor*

Vol. XI, No. 17 Wednesday, April 28, 1954 Washington, D. C.

Dien Bien Phu: The French fortress could be delivered quickly by an air force strike, if the French staff would permit it — so a high military source informs HUMAN EVENTS. If a squadron of bombers, carrying A-bombs, were to attack the besiegers of Dien Bien Phu, they could destroy the investing force completely and with no danger to the beleaguered French garrison. But, according to our sources, the French do not understand the military nature of such an air mission. The French, indeed, have shown no comprehension whatever of the use of air power in the Indo-China war; they consider it merely a tactical adjunct to ground warfare and waste planes on minor and futile "stunts."

Meanwhile, the U.S. Army and U.S. Navy, jealous of the developing preponderance of the U.S. Air Force, in our defense setup, seek to cut down its importance by propaganda minimizing the effects of atomic and hydrogen bombs. The Army propaganda runs as follows: "We can do it without the hydrogen and atom bombs." Also, the State Department plays hand-in-glove with this propaganda by opposing use of atomic weapons without prior consultation with the British. These are the reasons — we are reliably informed — why the way has been blocked for those in the General Staff who would like to relieve Dien Bien Phu by atomic air attack and who believe that such a coup could make Communist power lose face all over Asia.

Indeed, observers agree that the services have never been quite so "disunified" as they are at present. Incidentally, this situation has prompted many people in the Capital to believe wholeheartedly in Senator McCarthy's charge that the Army Department urged him to divert his probes away from the Army and to devote them to the Navy and Air Force. "It's just like the military bureaucrats just now," is the comment.

Indeed, one witticism going the rounds in the Pentagon symbolizes the terrific fight which the three services are waging against each other. The jest concerns the proposed use of the atom bomb to lift the siege of Dien Bien Phu. According to this jocular version the only way to clear the project with the Joint Chiefs of Staff would be as follows: (1) The Air Force would provide the plane, but it would have to be based on a naval aircraft carrier; (2) the bomb would have to be an Army atomic projectile; and (3) the bombardier would have to be a marine (therefore under orders from the Navy Department). The snapper: "And then we'd probably miss and drop it on the French."

The Big TV Show: The announcement by the National Broadcasting Company that it was withdrawing its TV coverage of the McCarthy probe has hit Capital observers with no mean force. While NBC, of course, probably had lost some money by the pre-emption of otherwise sponsored time by giving the coverage, there may be another reason — the planned inquisition of the Wisconsin Senator has "gone sour." McCarthy is making a rather good impression on the TV audience and the Army crowd has fumbled often. Also, the new Committee Counsel, Ray Jenkins of Tennessee, has not proved very merciful to them. Best index is the unhappy attitude of the left-wing press and radio men watching the proceedings. Yesterday, the anti-McCarthy Washington *Star* reported that the hearings "are bogging down into a dreary sparring match" — which is another way of admitting that the great scene as a means of discrediting the Wisconsin Senator has failed.

Another consideration, it is remarked here, may have affected the NBC decision. The average person viewing TV hearings formed his own impressions. The next morning he probably found to his disgust that the morning papers gave quite a different, anti-McCarthy version. After several days of

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1954 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this, what must his impression be of the integrity of the press? Naturally, there are exceptions in the press; the Hearst papers have done a good job, and one reporter at least — Willard Edwards of the Chicago *Tribune* — is singled out for praise.

One highly educational by-product of the affair has been McCarthy's attempt to distinguish between Secretary of the Army Stevens (whom he describes as an innocent, well-meaning person) and the civilian bureaucrats who run Stevens. Those who know their Pentagon say that the villain in the plot is the corps of left-wing bureaucrats in that Department: these men have sought to entrap and smear the Wisconsin Senator, fearing his revelations when he looks into their activities.

McCarthy might have cited the story on April 19 by INS correspondent David Sentner, who brought out in his dispatch that, while the proceedings were opening, the Army bureaucrats were arranging to send a U.S. military mission to train the Guatemalan Army. Guatemala is now the one Communist-controlled republic in Latin America! But what McCarthy has done by making a distinction between Stevens and the Army civilian bureaucrats is that he has brought out vividly, for all to see, the failure of the Ike Administration to oust the Acheson-Truman holdovers who have sabotaged so much of the program of the new GOP Administration.

The ADA Rides Again: Observers have been puzzled for some time about the Republican Senatorial situation in New Jersey. At first there were three candidates in the primary — Senator Robert C. Hendrickson running for re-election, Walter Margetts, Jr. and Clifford Case. Case was a former member of the House who quit politics to go with the Ford Foundation. Then he left the Ford Foundation and bobbed up to contest Hendrickson's Senate seat. Suddenly and somewhat mysteriously the three-man contest in the Republican primary was reduced to a sole survivor — Case. The other two withdrew. Margetts' withdrawal could be satisfactorily accounted for on the ground that he did not draw much water in Jersey politics. But that of Hendrickson was baffling.

However, some light is now beginning to filter through. Our sources say that the White House thought Presidential Assistant Barney Shanley successfully pressured Hendrickson to quit, and that the Senator is anything but happy over the treatment given him. Case is a politician with a New Deal voting record and is particularly fond of internationalism. Observers say that Case's left-wing political record made him a natural for the powerful Ford Foundation which is liberally manned by New Deal philosophers and UN internationalists.

While in Congress, Case endorsed House Concurrent Resolution 64 to "seek the development of the UN into a world federation." This was the resolution pushed by the United World Federalists, the organization which teems with pinks and some of even a darker hue. The fact that Case is committed one hundred per cent to world government is said to be the prime reason why the White House (suspected of planning to convert the UN into some form of world government no later than next year) pushed Hendrickson aside.

Hendrickson is also said to have stubbed his toe by being critical of the publishers of comic books which a Senate sub-committee headed by himself has been looking into. The comic book publishers, it is reported, have made their money bags felt in New Jersey and have clamored against the candidacy of Hendrickson.

Now there is evidence that Case is backed by the Americans for Democratic Action — the "socialist politburo in the U.S." Recently in the *Reporter* magazine, Violet M. Gunther, Political Secretary of Americans for Democratic Action, gave Case the blessing of the organization.

All this distresses many conservative Republicans in New Jersey. Latest talk is that an independent candidate might be put forward in the general election.

One World and the White House: Increasing discussion here centers on Robert Cutler, former President of the Old Colony Trust Company of Boston, who entered the White House as a presidential

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

assistant a year ago. Few news spotlights played on him during the past year when he served as Special Assistant to the President for National Security Council affairs, no mean post. (The National Security Council is the top planning body for our national diplomatic and political policies throughout the world.) Now we learn that "Bobby" Cutler has within recent weeks assumed the position of the President's chief adviser for psychological warfare, and as such, as liaison between the White House and the National Security Council, which makes the global decisions. Cutler, thus, takes the place recently vacated by Mr. C. D. Jackson, former Time-Life executive, who for the past year has been reportedly "brain-trusting" the President on global strategy. Jackson left for personal reasons, but he had been under fire by conservative Republicans on the score of appeasing our so-called "Allies," particularly Britain. Is Cutler of the same breed?

A check of our files brought to light a letter from a subscriber who had written about him: "In radio interviews I heard him giving UN Day a build-up, peddling our duty to Europe, Point Four, and world responsibility. He left no doubt that he favored the New Deal-Acheson foreign policies and he is definitely for world government."

Cutler as an advocate of world government particularly interested us and we began a tedious search of the files of Boston newspapers. In the Boston *Herald* for April 1, 1951, we found an interesting news item. It reported that Cutler took part in a dramatization sponsored by the United World Federalists to promote the idea of world government. Along with Cutler were some familiar left-wingers like Rex Stout, Oscar Hammerstein and others.

The *Herald* story said "Cutler who expressed the viewpoint of a businessman favoring world government, declared that free enterprise and democracy would disappear if there were a third world war. He urged a declaration by this country supporting world government." Finally, we recall that New Deal columnist Drew Pearson in a column some months ago described Cutler as a friend of Justice Felix Frankfurter.

The above portrait may not be complete, but it offers striking evidence that "one worldism" has a spokesman in a particularly important post on the highest level of the Executive branch of our Government.

Canada's Red Probes: We have never heard anyone charge that Canada is deficient in judicial fairness nor in her standards of freedom. But now it is revealed that our neighbors to the north apply much more drastic methods in protecting their national security from Red plotters than we do.

Judith Robinson of the Toronto *Telegram* recently came to Washington to study "McCarthyism." In her report she pointed out that the Canadian government has a *secret* security panel. Members of the panel are anonymous and may order the dismissal of any government employee as a security risk *without giving any stated reason or evidence — and there is no appeal.*

Miss Robinson found things very "liberal" here by contrast. Thus, she cited the instance of a United States Navy civilian draftsman who is to be given a public hearing on charges that might lead to his dismissal. "It could not have happened that way in Canada," she reported. "In Canada such a man would not have known that he had been accused. He would not have been permitted to learn what the accusation was, who had accused him, who were his judges or why they had reached their judgment. There would have been no appeal because there would have been no hearing. He would have been dismissed, period." In short, McCarthy's famous "methods" indeed seem extremely mild compared to those used in Canada.

Miss Robinson tells us that the Canadian Royal Commission has authority to order the arrest of any suspect. It can detain him for unlimited time, incommunicado, under conditions set by the Commission. It can compel a suspect to answer questions at the risk of self-incrimination and can require husbands to testify against their wives, wives against their husbands. (See also "Investigation and Civil

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Liberty" by C. Dickerman Williams in the May 3 issue of *The Freeman,* in which it is shown how stern is Canada, how lax is the U.S., in probes of subversives.)

Money Produces Nothing: Advocates of the "regulated" economy assume that the regulation can be effected by the manipulation of money. By making money "cheap," they confidently believe, the wheels of production will be speeded up when the market slows down and mass unemployment appears. And when the entrepreneur becomes "hoggish," borrows too much money and goes in for speculative production, the way to keep him in line is to raise interest rates and make money hard to get.

The theory has been repeatedly proven false. The latest demonstration that money neither stimulates nor retards production, and serves only as a convenient medium of exchange, is the experience of the Federal Reserve Board this spring. When unemployment began to show its ugly head some months ago, the Board decided to "ease up" on money by lowering its rediscount rates. But, the money was not borrowed, despite the lower interest. From the first of this year up to April 7, reports *The Wall Street Journal,* commercial loans in this country dropped from $23.4 billion to $22.7 billion. During the same period of last year, when the cost of money was higher, the trend was upward, not downward.

Like everything else, money becomes scarce when the demand for it increases. It becomes scarce and, therefore, the price of it goes up because industry needs it; and industry needs money only when people are working, making things that other people want and are willing to buy. In short, interest rates go up when production and exchange is lively. Interest rates are determined by productive activity; productive activity is not determined by interest rates. Raising or lowering interest rates by fiat does not control, manage or regulate the market place. Such interference with the market place has only a nuisance value.

Book Front: *The Myth of the Good and Bad Nations,* by René Wormser. Henry Regnery Company. $3.00.

The author of the above book, a New York lawyer, has followed the trail blazed by Albert Jay Nock, whose classic *The Myth of the Guilty Nation* (1922) was a civilized debunking of the official propaganda of the victors of World War I. Wormser accepts the Nock thesis as to the Germans of the Kaiser's day and extends it to the Germans under Hitler and the Japanese of World War II.

In his preliminary chapters, the author shows what Professors Barnes, Fay and other historians have well documented — that the Germans were only in part, a lesser part at that, responsible for the global explosion in 1914.

As to World War II, "Germany was the immediate aggressor, and under vicious leadership," says Mr. Wormser, "but this was merely act two in a long tragedy the end of which we have not yet seen." The author emphasizes that World War II was "what we now call a 'preventive war.' Insofar as it became a 'world war' it was started by England and France. No act of German aggression against either British or French territory had taken place. When Germany attacked Poland, England declared war and France followed suit. Was this truly in defense of a smaller nation? If so, why had not war been declared when Hitler absorbed Bohemia? If so, then why was war not declared on Russia, which shared the division of Poland and Germany?"

The author's final summary is that our experience both with Germany and Japan should lead to the abandonment of the thesis that there are "good nations" and "bad nations," that this erroneous concept which has shaped our foreign policy since 1914 should, therefore, be jettisoned and that danger of relying on this concept promises further trouble if it is applied to Soviet Russia. (The book includes an excellent preface by Dr. Raymond Moley.)

Entered as second class matter at the Post Office, Washington, D. C. Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial Subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. First class mail, one year, $11.00; six months, $6.00. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscription or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED